

Kathleen Norris Pictures Toll of Corner Saloons Near Homes of Poor

Author of "Mother" Pleads
for Wife and Children When
Husband Drinks

Brewers' Attorney
States Liquor Case

Dry Spots Near and Far
Are Cited for Both
Sides

Following the president of the New York liquor dealers who yesterday pleaded the cause of alcohol we hear to-day from a successful literary woman who contributes to the thirteenth instalment of views on the merits of prohibition.

Through the swinging doors of saloons on almost every corner along Second and Third avenues goes the tide of laboring men whose day's work is over. With appetite ruined and intelligence dulled, they go home to the women who suffer.

Before condemning prohibition, read the following powerful appeal from Kathleen Norris, who voices so well what so many women feel:

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I have been following the letters on the liquor question with intense interest, and am moved to add one more to their number to suggest to several of the anti-prohibitionists who have disbelieved the statistics of their opponents, that there are irrefutable statistics to be had for the seeing, which might perhaps account for the confidence with which the "drys" are following their course.

Let anyone who desires statistics go and stand, some spring afternoon, at five, at almost any corner of Third or Second avenue, its whole length, and let him notice, as he will in home cases out of ten, that four handsome and prosperous saloons occupy the four corners. In the tenth case one corner has a drug store or some other store.

Until the home-coming tide of laboring men and poorly paid office workers and salesmen begins, he might estimate the rents and cost of upkeep in the saloons; then let him watch the sons and fathers that go through those swinging doors, and let him ask himself honestly to what type of mothers and wives those men are returning. Let him ask himself whether the domestic budgets of those men can stand the strain of 15 cents or 30 cents or more, daily, thrown away. Let him ask himself whether the woman who has been setting a table, watching a stew and baking potatoes, nursing a baby and tucking it into bed (and perhaps has that day walked several blocks to buy meat at 3 cents a pound cheaper, carried children to school, and soiled, and temporized with the man who collects for the sewing machine) is in a mood to be faced during dinner by a heavy, dull and tired husband, whose appetite is ruined and whose intelligence is dulled by three drinks of whiskey.

The men who frequent these saloons all go into the poorest of apartments and flats, and the toll of these saloons (and it would be interesting to know just what their total gross receipts are) comes out of those homes. Imagine the reverse situation, and that it was the working women who felt that they must sandwich a dangerous and expensive stimulant between the office and the home, and you would have legislation fast enough.

Abandon Hope When
"Husband Drinks"

Pending the passage of laws that will make a poor man's children a government rather than a personal expense, I sometimes do a little charitable dabbling, in a small way, and I know this: that when one woman of the relief committee of our village turns to another with the words, "Husband drinks," or "wife drinks," we have learned to abandon hope for that particular family. They may still inquire, and be given blankets and coal, but there is no rehabilitation while that condition lasts. I think the books of all the charitable organizations would bear this out. I know some of the individual workers emphatically agree with me.

In San Francisco, immediately after the earthquake, we had blanks for the ailments of relief to fill in, and many good families accepted help then. But six months later the blanks were changed and a space was made to follow the inquiry: "Who drinks? Families that needed help six months after the catastrophe had a drunkard. 'The father drinks.' 'The mother drinks.' I ask any woman who has ever done work among the poorer people if she is not sickeningly familiar with those phrases.

Free will is, of course, delightful, but we have accepted the draft and no Sunday baseball, and for that matter, no Sunday drinks, in New York, with great philosophy. Here is one more step that the men with self-control can voluntarily take to help their weaker neighbor.

I don't believe the most rabid anti-prohibitionist would hesitate a second if his daughter asked him whether she would marry Jack Jones, who drank, or Tom Smith, who didn't. I don't believe he would contemplate with any particular pleasure that same daughter accustoming herself to a cocktail before dinner, and admitting that she would miss it. If the other side can quote the first miracle we can go higher than that, to the Lord's own commandment, that a man love his neighbor as himself.

The blow of prohibition will fall heavily on the habitual drinker, and perhaps he will solace himself, in extreme cases, with drugs. But the boys growing up will not, can not form the habit that I truly believe is at the bottom of half the misery of to-day, and is one of the reasons why they are poor and why they have been for generations too befuddled to look out for their own rights and establish long-awaiting changes that will make for betterment everywhere. Yours sincerely, KATHLEEN NORRIS.

Port Washington, N. Y.

From Wine to Whiskey;

From Opium to Heroin

The study of many cases of drug addiction has convinced Dr. Charles A. Rosewater, of Newark, that the prohibition of alcoholic beverages only stimulates the use of habit-forming drugs. He reasons that al-

cohol used moderately is preferable to the use of drugs.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: May I suggest the importance of giving due consideration to the relations between prohibition and the use of habit-forming drugs?

Thoughtful students of the subject have always insisted that prohibition is detrimental to mankind, because it favors the use of the stronger alcoholic preparations in place of the milder ones and because it favors the use of habit-forming drugs. Reports from observers in the prohibition states confirm this view. One witness testified before the Whitney investigating committee of New York that three doctors in Memphis, Tenn., had written \$5,000 prescriptions for narcotic drugs within six months.

My own investigations of conditions in West Virginia also confirm the use of narcotics in that state. That the United States government has definite information that the use of narcotic drugs is increasing is shown by the fact that there has recently been started a national investigation of the entire subject.

The lesson taught by the prohibition of opium smoking should also be considered. As chief of the narcotic clinic for the study and treatment of drug addicts of the city of Newark, I study many cases of drug addiction. Almost every patient at the clinic is a heroin user, and almost every one began the use of drugs as a pleasure smoker of opium. When opium smoking, admittedly the least harmful form of drug addiction, was prohibited and smoking opium or "hop" was very difficult to get the opium smokers turned to the use of morphine, and when this was hard to obtain they turned to the use of heroin, the most deadly narcotic drug in use.

For ages wise men have been effectively preaching the doctrine of temperance, and almost everybody is temperate and takes alcohol in some form or other in moderation, probably in response to an inborn craving or hunger for a stimulant. Recognizing this indisputable fact, and admitting that the moderate use of alcohol is preferable to the use of drugs, let us regulate the liquor traffic by just and sensible laws, and enforce those laws.

CHARLES A. ROSEWATER, M.D.

Why Kill the

Joys of Life?

The following statement of the case for liquor is from William H. Hirst, attorney for the New York State Brewers' Association and counsel for the Society of Restaurateurs of New York. Mr. Hirst writes:

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Prohibition approaches the so-

lution of social problems from the wrong end. It is an attempt to make the history and the laws of a country follow the lead of the weak and mentally subnormal individual instead of the strong and rational one. To abridge the rights of the normal person because of the failings of the subnormal is like burning the barn in order to drive out the rats. If an institution or a privilege is going to be abolished because of the harm it does to the weak or subnormal person, then most every indulgence and luxury, and in fact many necessities, must be taken from the reach of all people.

If we are going to bring about absolute prohibition because indulgence in alcoholic drink is harmful to a few, then with equal reason must we stop the use of tobacco, candy, high-heeled shoes, and put an end to ragtime music, the sensationalism of the yellow press, the poker playing of the men, the mysticism and the superstition of the new fancy churches, the hysterics of the baseball games, the noise of the Fourth of July and the wild scramble for success, prestige and glory. All of these injure the nervous system of some persons and on the whole unit more of the subnormal and irrational instead of lifting the subnormal and irrational to the plane of the normal and rational person down to the level of the subnormal and irrational.

The inherent and insurmountable objection to absolute prohibition consists in the fact that it brings the normal and rational person down to the level of the subnormal and irrational instead of lifting the subnormal and irrational to the plane of the normal and rational person down to the level of the subnormal and irrational.

The problem of prohibition does not only affect thirst, is not only concerned with whether alcohol is real medicine or food, or whether it prohibits or does not prohibit, or whether for law and makes hypocrites, or whether it is a source of emotional legislation. The question is whether or not the great mass of the people should be deprived of the congeniality and social relaxation which come from a glass of wine or a glass of beer because there are a few who are so emotionally dried up that the stimulation of beer or wine will fail to revive life and spirit, or some few others who are so beyond the restraint and control of their brain that any indulgence or act which stimulates emotion will send them to excesses, or possibly some others who are so filled with exuberance by nature that they need not the relaxation of the joys in life as an impetus for ambition and accomplishment.

All alcoholic beverages cannot be put in the same category. There is a difference between the hard, spirituous liquors of high alcoholic content, such as whiskey, gin and rum, and the lighter alcoholic beverages, such as

beer and wine. With respect to beer and wine, it cannot be said that their use is harmful. The whole experience of the human race contradicts this assumption. These beverages have been used from the beginning of historic times.

The pleasure to be had from wine is referred to in every work of literary merit from Homer to Longfellow and Tennyson, is glorified in history and in legend, is sung in music and portrayed in art and is testified to by the best brains and the best men and women of every age and of every land inhabited by the Caucasian people. The world would never have achieved its progress if the attitude of resignation and gloom which the prohibitionists would establish had become the prevailing trait of mankind. Those who have opened to life the resources of the world and the sweetness and charm of nature were men who longed for excitement and the vividness of experience which have been and still are inspired by the moderate use of beer and wine. WILLIAM H. HIRST.

Rockland Routs

Rock and Rye

After a year of experience without licensed saloons, a substantial majority of the voters of the town of Rockland, Sullivan County, affirmed the no-license régime, according to P. M. Many, who writes:

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Were it not for the tragic results of the liquor traffic it would be amusing to read the "bosh" that those who favor the traffic write to beg of issue or to bolster their own opinions as to personal liberty, labor unrest and right and beer.

I inclose portions of a letter which I wrote for our local no license committee for the town of Rockland, Sullivan County, which was sent to every voter in the town.

"The liquor men do not raise the question of right or wrong, because they know that the traffic is wrong in the sight of God and man, and that you would vote it down five to one on that basis; so they try to pass by this all sufficient reason and appeal to your pocketbook or selfishness, or make a personal appeal for their own personal benefit."

"No business man, workman, farmer or professional man, anything to sell, be it merchandise, labor, produce or service, can figure the liquor business anything but a keen, active competitor for his customers' money, and at the same time it lowers his customers' earning power. The saloon gets the cash, you must extend the credit and we must all help pay the lost accounts. We must support the family of the man who spends all at the saloon."

"With the present high cost of living no one except the rich can spend anything over the bar without giving up something in food, clothing, house rent, fuel, time, amusements and pleasures to which you and your family are entitled."

LIVINGSTON MANOR, N. Y.

A Compromise

Toward Solving Problem

In a careful analysis of drink and drinkers W. L. Temple concludes

that the use of any kind of alcohol should be denied to persons to whom it does direct or indirect harm, including those of slender means. The difficulty of defining this class is obvious. Possibly the drink evil might be mitigated by legislation permitting the sale of liquor only to holders of income tax receipts.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: On reading the communications being published in your paper for and against prohibition, it is interesting to see that the prohibitionists almost without exception hold up the so-called hard liquors for castigation and base their arguments on the harm they allege results from their use, and entirely ignore the harmlessness, or supposed harmlessness, of beers and light wines; and it is equally interest-

ing to see the anti-prohibitionists allowing themselves to be put into the position of attempting to uphold hard liquor for beverage purposes.

That the prohibitionists will win out easily if the contest is carried out on these lines goes without saying, and this is especially obvious when the two parties to the contest are examined.

On the one hand are the prohibitionists, self-sufficient, convinced of the righteousness of their cause, coherent every sort of crankism. Opposed to them is a collection of sellers and manufacturers of alcoholic beverages, whose interest in the question is entirely commercial, and with whom it is difficult or impossible for the believers in the reasonable use of alcohol to ally themselves.

Users of alcoholic drinks must also be classified to make any discussion of this situation intelligent, and their social, physical and moral status analyzed.

Clearly some human beings cannot

and must not be allowed to drink anything alcoholic. Under this class come: 1. Those individuals on whom alcohol acts to impair or destroy self-control, and who consequently are offensive or dangerous to others.

2. Those who cannot afford to drink because of slender means and the consequent inconveniences and hardships to dependents that follow.

3. Persons suffering with certain diseases.

The first groups must be controlled in some other way, just as in the case of drug addicts, and the details of a plan looking toward this end ought surely to be capable of arrangement. Opposed to the individuals falling into any of these three groups, who evidently must form a minority of the population, is the vast majority. Many of these are non-drinkers from choice, and yet a great many do use alcoholic beverages and are not harmed by them and do no harm to others since they include those whose means allow them to drink—who know how to drink.

It goes without saying that alcoholic combinations, of which whiskey is the

type, have no irreplaceable position among beverages, and only find a necessary use in the treatment of certain diseases, of which sepsis (blood poisoning) is best known.

Those beverages containing a relatively small percentage of alcohol, of which beer is the type, fall into a different category, and that they have an unsalutary place in the social organization is not to be denied.

There are almost never followed by the diseases due to the high percentage drinks, "intoxication" by them is unusual. They are inexpensive.

They do promote cordial sociability and do contain enough alcohol to conceal the sense of the physical weariness of toil and the mental weariness of many situations.

So that the reasonable solution of the prohibition question would seem to lie in (1) confining the use of the high percentage liquors to medicine; (2) denying the use of any kind of alcohol to those to whom it does direct or indirect harm; and (3) allowing the rest of the population to use low percentage beverages. W. L. TEMPLE.



Monroe Clothes

\$17

GOLD LABEL



\$17

GOLD LABEL



\$17

GOLD LABEL



\$50

Liberty Bond

given away
for
BEST SLOGAN

Monroe Clothes offer a \$50 Liberty Bond for the best seven word advertising slogan on Monroe Clothes. Slogans should be based primarily on Monroe quality and sales method. No entry fee. All entries received up to and including June 1st considered. Send in as many as you like.

In addition to the Liberty Bond given away for the best slogan, \$1.00 in Thrift Stamps will be given for each of the fifty next best slogans.

The following slogan suggestions should give you an idea—

Direct from maker to you—Monroe Clothes.
Upstairs Monroe Shops lower your clothes cost.
Dress better for less—wear Monroe Clothes.

Mail all slogans to Advertising Department, Monroe Clothes Shop, 42nd St. & Broadway.

\$21

BLACK & WHITE LABEL



\$25

BLUE LABEL



\$25

BLUE LABEL



Monroe Clothes

SUITS - TOPCOATS **NO CHARGE FOR ALTERATIONS** **EVENING CLOTHES**

America's Largest Retail Clothiers

SATISFACTION GUARANTEED OR MONEY REFUNDED

A Business Should be as Big as Its Job

If bigness is of benefit to the public it should be commended.

The size of a business depends upon the needs which that business is called upon to serve. A business should be as big as its job. You do not drive tacks with a pile-driver—or piles with a tack-hammer.

Swift & Company's growth has been the natural and inevitable result of national and international needs.

Large-scale production and distribution are necessary to convert the live stock of the West into meat and by-products, and to distribute them over long distances to the consuming centers of the East and abroad.

Only an organization like that of Swift & Company, with its many packing plants, hundreds of distributing houses, and thousands of refrigerator cars, would have been able to handle the varying seasonal supplies of live stock, and meet the present war emergency by supplying, without interruption:

First—The U. S. soldiers and the Allies in Europe by shipping as much as 800 carloads of meat products in a single week!

Second—The cantonments in the United States.

Third—The retailers upon whom the American public depends for its daily supply of meat.

But many people ask—Do producers and consumers pay too much for the complex service rendered?

Everyone, we believe, concedes the efficiency of the Swift & Company organization—in performing a big job in a big way at a minimum of expense.

Swift & Company's total profit in 1917 was less than 4 cents on each dollar of sales of meat and by-products. Elimination of this profit would have had practically no effect on live stock and meat prices.

Do you believe that this service can be rendered for less by any other conceivable method of organization or operation?

These questions and others are answered fully and frankly in the Swift & Company 1918 Year Book sent free on request. Address Swift & Company, U. S. Yards, Chicago

Swift & Company, U. S. A.

